BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW Los Angeles

- 3. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 4. 13 14 15 5. 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
 - 3. Responding to the allegations of paragraph 3, Answering Defendant admits that as an employee of Cardinal Health, Inc., Plaintiff was eligible to participate in group long-term disability coverage under the group long-term disability plan sponsored by Cardinal Health, Inc., which is governed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. § 1001, et seq. The long-term disability plan was funded through a group insurance policy purchased from Continental Casualty Company and was administered by Hartford Life and Accident Insurance Company. Except as expressly admitted or alleged herein, Answering Defendant denies each and every allegation of said paragraph.
 - 4. Responding to the allegations of paragraph 4, Answering Defendant admits that jurisdiction is invoked by the existence of a federal question arising under ERISA.
 - 5. Responding to the allegations of paragraph 5, Answering Defendant admits that while working for Cardinal Health, Inc., Plaintiff made a claim for long-term disability benefits under the Cardinal Health, Inc. Long Term Disability Plan. Plaintiff's claim was approved and he was paid long-term disability benefits until approximately October 2007, at which time his claim was terminated. Answering Defendant further admits that Plaintiff appealed the decision. On or about March 26, 2008, Hartford informed Plaintiff that the termination of his claim was being upheld on appeal. Except as expressly admitted or alleged herein, Answering Defendant denies each and every allegation of said paragraph.
 - 6. Responding to the allegations of paragraph 6, Answering Defendant admits that while working for Cardinal Health, Inc., Plaintiff made a claim for long-term disability benefits under the Cardinal Health, Inc. Long Term Disability Plan.

- 2 -

25

26

27

28

LA #4849-5118-8994 v1

1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 1

Plaintiff's claim was approved and he was paid long-term disability benefits until approximately October 2007, at which time his claim was terminated. Answering Defendant further admits that Plaintiff appealed the decision. On or about March 26, 2008, Hartford informed Plaintiff that the termination of his claim was being upheld on appeal. Except as expressly admitted or alleged herein, Answering Defendant denies each and every allegation of said paragraph.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

7. Responding to the allegations of paragraph 7, Answering Defendant admits that while working for Cardinal Health, Inc., Plaintiff made a claim for long-term disability benefits under the Cardinal Health, Inc. Long Term Disability Plan. Plaintiff's claim was approved and he was paid long-term disability benefits until approximately October 2007, at which time his claim was terminated. Answering Defendant further admits that Plaintiff appealed the decision. On or about March 26, 2008, Hartford informed Plaintiff that the termination of his claim was being upheld on appeal. Except as expressly admitted or alleged herein, Answering Defendant denies each and every allegation of said paragraph.

17

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

19

20

21

22

23

18

8. Plaintiff's claims should be dismissed because Answering Defendant discharged its duties with respect to the Plan solely in the interest of Plan participants and beneficiaries and, in so doing, acted in accordance with the documents and instruments governing the Plan.

24

25

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

26

27

28

LA #4849-5118-8994 v1

9. Plaintiff's claims should be dismissed because Answering Defendant did not act arbitrarily or capriciously in administering Plaintiff's claim, but rather

BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
LOS ANGELES

Document 6

Filed 08/28/2008

Case 3:08-cv-01150-L-NLS

BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW LOS ANGELES

LA #4849-5118-8994 v1

PROOF OF SERVICE

Moi v. Cardinal Health, Inc., Group LTD Benefit Plan.

3

4

5

6

7

9

1

2

I am a citizen of the United States and employed in Los Angeles County, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within-entitled action. My business address is 444 South Flower Street, Suite 2400, Los Angeles, California 90071-2953. On August 28, 2008, I served a copy of the within document(s) entitled **DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO**

8

by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California addressed as set forth below.

11

10

by electronic service of the document(s) through the Court's transmission facilities.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Brooks L. Iler

Virgil A. Iler

COMPLAINT

X

Iler & Iler, LLP

13400 Pomerado Road

Poway, CA 92064

Tel: (858) 413-1551

Fax: (858) 413-1553

Email: brooks@ilerlaw.com, virgil@ilerlaw.com

I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made. Executed on August 28, 2008, at Los Angeles, California.

Barbara W. Jeong

27 28

BURKE, WILLIAMS & SORENSEN, LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW LOS ANGELES